DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 956 SO 016 834

AUTHOR Pellegrino, Edmund D.; And Others
TITLE The Teaching of Values and the Successor Generation: The Atlantic Council's Working Group on the Successor Generation. Educational Series Policy Papers.
INSTITUTION Atlantic Council of the United States, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Feb 83
NOTE 35p.; For related documents, see ED 255 399 and SO 016 833.
AVAILABLE FROM The Atlantic Council of the United States, 1616 H St., N.W., Washington, DC 20006 ($5.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Controversial Issues (Course Content); *Democracy; *Democratic Values; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Role of Education; School Responsibility; *School Role; Social Values

ABSTRACT

The civic values of democratic societies and the responsibilities of educational institutions to transmit these values to succeeding generations are discussed. Free societies cannot survive unless the values upon which they are grounded are fully comprehended and practiced by each generation. But each generation must also transmit those values faithfully to the successor generation, those who are to succeed to leadership and power in their own countries and in the world. There has recently been a disturbing uncertainty and confusion about the traditional values of Western democracy in the countries of the Atlantic community. There is a need to refurbish that common denominator of values, without which the democratic way of life cannot successfully resist the counter-values prevalent in so many countries today. Discussed here are what values constitute the common denominator and how they should be transmitted to succeeding generations. The publication includes the names of those who participated in the Atlantic Council's working group on the successor generation. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDUCATIONAL SERIES

ED261956

Policy Papers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Theodore C. Achilles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE TEACHING OF VALUES AND THE SUCCESSOR GENERATION

The Atlantic Council's Working Group on the Successor Generation

Edmund D. Pellegrino, *Chairman*
Theodore C. Achilles, *Project Director*

Foreword by Kenneth Rush

LC 96 P34

TO APPEAR IN PART IN
The Atlantic Community Quarterly

THE ATLANTIC COUNCIL OF THE UNITED STATES

The Atlantic Council, established twenty-one years ago, seeks to strengthen the mutually advantageous ties between the nations and people of the "Atlantic Community." It is a community not in a geographic sense but one of common fundamental values, based on the principles of democracy, individual dignity and the rule of law.

Its members are dedicated to the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions and by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded.

In an increasingly interdependent world where "foreign" policy is ever more closely intertwined with "domestic" policies, there is a clear need for both official and private consideration of means of dealing with problems which transcend national frontiers. The Atlantic Council is a unique non-governmental, bi-partisan, tax-exempt, educational, citizens' organization. It conducts its programs to promote understanding of major international security, political and economic problems, foster informed public debate on these issues, and make substantive policy recommendations to both the Executive and Legislative branches of the US Government, as well as to the appropriate key international organizations.

The Board of Directors of the Atlantic Council is composed of some one hundred prominent leaders and experts in business, finance, labor and education, together with former senior government officials. Their names are listed on the back cover of this *Policy Paper*.

While the Council's work is financed in large measure by corporations, foundations, and labor unions, it could not continue its work were it not for the annual generosity of hundreds of contributing Sponsors, who—in turn—share in the total publications of the Council. You are invited to b come a Council Sponsor. An application is enclosed at the back of this publication.

The Atlantic Council of the United States
1616 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 347-9353

The Teaching of Values and The Successor Generation

The Atlantic Council's
Working Group on the Successor Generation

Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino
Chairman

Theodore C. Achilles
Project Director

Dr. Leslie S. Brady
Staff Director

Martha C. Finley
Assistant Project Director

Washington, D.C.
February, 1983

Additional copies of this policy paper

THE TEACHING OF VALUES
AND THE SUCCESSOR GENERATION

may be ordered at $5.00 prepaid from the Atlantic Council

* * * * * *

The Atlantic Council's brochure, ISSUES AND OPTIONS, is available gratis upon request

Copyright© 1983
by The Atlantic Council of the United States

The Atlantic Council of the United States
1616 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 347-9353

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword, by Kenneth Rush	**5**
Members of the Working Group	**8**
The Teaching of Values And The Successor Generation	**11**
Part I. The Civic Values of Democratic Societies	**13**
Part II. The Responsibilities of Educational Institutions	**19**
Democratic Values in the Future	**25**
Additional Comments, by Judith Torney-Purta, Carole L. Hahn, and James Becker	**27**
Footnotes	**28**
Appendix	**29**
Statement on "Common Basic Values of the West", adopted by the Conference on the Atlantic Community, Bruges, 1957, and on "The Moral and Spiritual Values of the Atlantic Community", adopted by the Atlantic Congress, London, 1959	

"Together we must build a Community which will best safeguard the individual freedom and national values of our respective peoples while enabling us to deal adequately with problems with which no nation, today, can deal adequately alone."

Dwight D. Eisenhower
Farewell message to NATO,
December 1960

"Realism shows us a world deeply troubled, yet with reason for hope. There is one necessary condition: The only way we can enhance and amplify the human potential is by preserving, defending and extending those most precious of conditions—Freedom and Peace."

Secretary of State **George Shultz**
to the United Nations General
Assembly,
September 30, 1982

" . . . We must do everything to restore education to its place in the hierarchy of national values that we as educators know it deserves if the other values of the nation are to be preserved, revitalized and transmitted to future generations."

George H. Hanford
President of the College Board
at its annual meeting,
October 27, 1982

" . . . Students want and need to know where educated people stand, not on passing issues but on matters of enduring importance, matters that always have been the concern of the humanities: courage, fidelity, friendship, honor, love, justice, goodness, ambiguity, time, power, faith."

William J. Bennett
Chairman, National Endowment
for the Humanities, quoted in
The Wall Street Journal,
December 31, 1982

FOREWORD

The Atlantic Council of the United States is a bi-partisan non-governmental, educational organization, supported on a non-profit basis by corporations, foundations, labor unions and private individuals. It maintains close working relations with comparable organizations in other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and shares findings and ideas with them.

The Council was founded in the conviction that the nations of the Atlantic area are part of a true community and are members of a common civilization. To advance this civilization they depend upon each other for their freedom and the preservation of their fundamental values. They share a commitment to stability and progress, and to uniting their efforts in behalf of peace and security.

Increasing concern has been expressed by government officials, academicians and others that young people on each side of the Atlantic are approaching leadership positions without adequate knowledge of each other or of the common heritage and values of Western civilization.

It was feared that this tendency, unless checked and reversed, boded ill for the solidarity needed in today's interdependent and turbulent international environment and for efforts to build a better world order.

The Council accordingly assembled a group of exceptionally qualified practitioners in education and world affairs, chaired by Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino, then President of The Catholic University of America and now John Carroll Professor of Medicine and Medical Humanities at Georgetown University.

In January 1981, the Council published the Group's preliminary Policy Paper, "The Successor Generation: Its Challenges and Responsibilities." That paper stated that:

"The Working Group believes that citizen participation in the governance of society is the heart of democracy, that education today requires a much higher degree than ever before of international content to prepare citizens to deal with national and international problems, that

civic responsibility has an ethical base, and that our heritage of democratic freedoms today faces anti-democratic forces which threaten Western society and require its internal strengthening and ability to withstand diverse external threats.

"Strengthening the American educational system to meet these challenges presents a monumental task."

In view of the magnitude of the task the Group has been keenly aware that attainment of its objectives could be achieved only by working to the maximum possible extent through existing *leverage groups*, such as professional associations and institutions of learning rather than individuals.

The list of members of the Group indicates the principal organizations with and through which we are working, but we have fruitful relations with many others.

The principal international organizations with which we are working include the Council of Europe, the Atlantic Treaty Association, the North Atlantic Assembly and the Atlantic Institute.

We are grateful to the United States Information Service, the North Atlantic Foundation, the Exxon Education Foundation, the Lounsbery Foundation, the J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Deluxe Check Printers Foundation for their interest and support of our efforts.

During the past two years we have been working along several lines. One is to stimulate greater attention to European studies, including modern as well as earlier history, language and culture. Another is to encourage the preparation of supplemental teaching materials on these subjects. A third is a series of "Young Leadership" meetings—bringing together groups of persons between the ages of 25-35 who are already in responsible positions in their respective countries in the fields of government, business, labor, education and the media.

A fourth is the teaching of values, the subject of this second paper in our Educational Series. While the paper sets forth the general views of the Working Group, it should not be implied that every member supports every statement therein.

Two years ago the Working Group was concerned by what it saw as a "value-neutral" approach by various educators, an approach which questioned the necessity or desirability of teaching ethical civic values or democratic principles. In the intervening months, the members of the Group have become increasingly conscious of a reversal of this trend—a revival of the belief that the nature of tomorrow's world depends upon the transmission to succeeding generations of the common heritage and values of Western civilization.

The Working Group intends to continue, with the cooperation of the

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars and the Society for Values in Higher Education, to encourage and assist educational institutions for all levels to develop this trend.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Pellegrino and his Group for the work they are doing.

KENNETH RUSH
Chairman

The Atlantic Council's
Working Group on the Successor Generation

CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Edmund D. Pellegrino, John Carroll Professor of Medicine and Medical Humanities, Georgetown University Medical Center; former President of The Catholic University of America

VICE CHAIRMAN:

Dr. James H. Billington, Director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Theodore C. Achilles, former Counselor of the State Department, and Ambassador

STAFF DIRECTOR:

Dr. Leslie S. Brady, former Career Officer of the USIA and consultant to it

ASST. PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Martha C. Finley, former Administrator, U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO

MEMBERS:

John Agresto, Assistant Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities

George H. Baird, President, Educational Research Council of America

Leonard J. Baldyga, Director, European Affairs, U.S. Information Agency

Thomas A. Bartlett, Chancellor, University of Alabama System; former President, Association of American Universities

Carol Baumann, Director, International Studies and Programs, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

James Becker, Director, Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University

Landrum R. Bolling, former President, Earlham College and Chairman, Council on Foundations

Ernest L. Boyer, President, Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching

Hodding Carter III, former Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs

Harlan Cleveland, Director, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Policy; former U.S. Ambassador to NATO and Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs

Gordon Craig, Sterling Professor in Humanities; Chairman, History Department, Stanford University

George L. Crowell, Associate Dean, The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies

Mark H. Curtis, President, Association of American Colleges

Raymond English, Senior Research Associate, Ethics & Public Policy Center, Georgetown University

Alvin C. Eurich, President, Academy for Educational Development

James Fallows, Washington Editor, The Atlantic Monthly

Werner J. Feld, Chairman, Committee on Atlantic Studies

Charles Foster, Executive Director, Committee on Atlantic Studies
Andrew J. Goodpaster, former Superintendent, U.S. Military Academy
Lincoln Gordon, former President of The Johns Hopkins University and Ambassador
Carole L. Hahn, Associate Professor, Emory University
M. Wesley Hanson, Jr., Graduate Student, Georgetown University
John C. Harper, Rector, St. John's Church, Lafayette Square
Rose L. Hayden, Executive Director, National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies
James R. Huntley, Senior Fellow, Battelle Seminars and Studies Program
David Imig, Executive Director, National Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Ronald Inglehart, Director, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan
Eugenia Kemble, American Federation of Teachers
David Kennedy, Professor of History, Stanford University
Frank H. Klassen, Executive Director, International Council on Education for Teaching
Peter F. Krogh, Dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University
Carol Laise, former Director General of the Foreign Service and Ambassador
James R. Leutze, Chairman, Curriculum in Peace, War, and Defense, and Professor of History, University of North Carolina
Winston Lord, President, Council on Foreign Relations
Sheilah K. Mann, Director, Educational Affairs, American Political Science Association
Leonard H. Marks, Chairman, Foreign Policy Association; former Director of USIA
Duane Mattheis, Educational Research Council of America
Howard Mehlinger, Dean, School of Education, Indiana University
Steven Muller, President, The Johns Hopkins University
John J. O'Connor, Vicar General, Military Ordinariate
William C. Olson, Dean, School of International Service, American University
Robert E. Osgood, Christian Herter Professor of International Relations, The Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies; former Dean, SAIS
George R. Packard, Dean, The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies
Judith Torney-Purta, Professor of Human Development, University of Maryland; former Vice Chairman, US Committee on UNESCO
John Richardson, Jr., President, Freedom House and of Youth for Understanding; former Assistant Secretary of State
Olin C. Robison, President, Middlebury College
Edna Rostow, former Consultant in Psychiatry, Yale University
Elizabeth Scott, Associate Director, National Council for the Social Studies
Joseph Sisco, former Chancellor, American University
Andrew F. Smith, President, Global Perspectives in Education
David C. Smith, Executive Director, Society for Values in Higher Education
Howard K. Smith, Television News Analyst
Helmut Sonnenfeldt, former Counselor, Department of State

Phillips Stevens, Headmaster Emeritus, Williston Academy
Richard W. Van Wagenen, Academic Advisor, Atlantic Council; former Dean of the Graduate School, American University
Robert E. Ward, Director, Center for Research in International Studies, Stanford University
Arthur Welsh, Senior Economist and Program Director, Joint Council on Economic Education
Darnell M. Whitt, former Executive Director, Committee of Nine, and Member, U.S. Mission to NATO
C. Tyler Wood, former Marshall Plan Ambassador

EX OFFICIO:

Kenneth Rush, Chairman of the Atlantic Council; former Deputy Secretary of State and Defense, and Ambassador
Henry H. Fowler, Vice Chairman of the Atlantic Council; former Secretary of the Treasury
Francis O. Wilcox, Director General of the Atlantic Council; former Assistant Secretary of State; Dean, School of Advanced International Studies, The Johns Hopkins University; and Chief of Staff, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations
Joseph W. Harned, Deputy Director General, Atlantic Council
J. Allan Hovey, Director, Atlantic Council

The Teaching of Values And The Successor Generation

Free societies cannot survive unless the values upon which they are grounded are fully comprehended and practiced by each generation. But each generation must also transmit those values faithfully to the "successor generation"—those who are to succeed to leadership and power, in their own countries and in the world.

Cognizant of this reality, this Working Group of the Atlantic Council, in its first policy paper* pointed to a disturbing uncertainty and confusion, about the traditional values of Western Democracy in the countries of the Atlantic community. It underscored the need to refurbish that common denominator of values without which the democratic way of life cannot successfully resist the counter-values prevalent in so many countries today.

This second working paper addresses two of the next questions: What values constitute the common denominator? and, How should they be transmitted to succeeding generations?

**The Successor Generation: Its Challenges And Responsibilities*, 1981.

PART I

The Civic Values of Democratic Societies

The word "values" is widely used today but with such divergent meanings that it is requisite at the outset to define it operationally. In this paper, we shall use "values" in the sense suggested by Richard Morill:

> . . . standards in, of, and for action . . . patterns and standards of choice that guide persons towards satisfaction, fulfillment and meaning . . . They serve as foci for human aspirations and they orient, not determine, choices through which human beings are enabled to solve problems, to avoid impasses and impossible situations, and to create an open future.[1]

Values are the beliefs we hold about the things we think worthwhile—the things we are willing to work, suffer, pay and even die for. They define our choices, and our choices reveal our values. With unclear or shifting values societies and individuals lose their character, become confused about the future and eventually disintegrate. Without them technocracy and bureaucracy can too easily become morally blind.

There are values of many kinds—moral, social, economic, cultural, ethnic, economic and political. Our concern is with civic values—more specifically those crucial to free and democratic societies. We must, therefore, define "democracy" as well as values.

Democracy centers on the concept of "government by the people," of a society in which citizens control the political process. Democracy is grounded in the idea of the individual as a rational being with a free will, endowed with spirit and capable of more than a physical existence. On this view, the dignity and worth of individuals, and their freedom to choose a form of government, of worship, and a way of life for themselves and their children are universal values. They are values intrinsic to the humanity of all peoples including those subject to totalitarian rule. The degree to which a government ensures, enhances and practices these values determines whether it is in fact democratic.

Implicit in this concept are two things: individual responsibility and the need to assent to the values that preserve the individual's freedom. Indeed, the health of a democratic society depends on the extent to which the minds of its citizens are free and informed enough to guide governments and experts in the humane use of knowledge, resources and power. "Freedom isn't free"—it is paid for by responsible citizenship.

To remain free, the individual must recognize the attendant personal obligations, costs and self-sacrifices.

The values that characterize Western democracy have evolved since ancient times. They are rooted in the traditions of Greece and Rome, and shaped by the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition. The Magna Carta, the French Declaration of Rights of Man, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are landmarks in the evolution of civic values. This civic value system is "Western" not in any exclusive sense but because it developed in a small group of Western nations, which, despite many lapses, have exerted great efforts to preserve and practice it. Today, it represents a universal aspiration for all of mankind. In Teilhard de Chardin's words:

> "That which had long been known elsewhere only took on its definitive human value in becoming incorporated in the system of European ideas and activities, extended more recently to the New World. . . . The proof of this lies in the fact that from one end of the earth to the other, all the peoples, to remain free or to become more so, are inexorably led to formulate the hopes and problems of the modern earth in the very same terms in which the West has formulated them."[2]

To study and propagate these values is not to nurture chauvinism but to affirm their viability as guides to the fulfillment and satisfaction of all human societies. The "Atlantic Community" is in no sense an exclusive club. Rather it is an example of an open, pluralistic society, held together by a common civic value system.

The men who wrote the American Constitution and the Bill of Rights were educated in the classic works of Western culture. American education has embraced this heritage and its principles of pluralistic democracy and has transmitted its principles and underlying values to succeeding generations. The great glory of America to much of the world has been its living exemplification of the worth and viability of democratic values for all its citizens.

The cataclysm of World War II, together with a consciousness of the implications of a technological age, sparked a wide desire to apply the basic human rights and values of the democratic tradition in the service of international order. Thus, the Charter of the United Nations signed in 1945 opens with the words:[3]

> "We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
>
> "to reaffirm faith in the fundamental human rights, in the dignity

and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

"to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

"to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom . . . "

In 1948 the UN "Universal Declaration on Human rights"[4] spoke of the:

" . . . recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

It proclaimed as universal the right "to life, liberty and security of person . . . to freedom of thought, conscience and religion . . . (and) to take part in the governance of his country." These words and concepts owe much to the Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. They show as well the extent of their universal appeal.

Despite these aspirations, by 1947 Soviet power had spread across half of Europe and cast long shadows over a good part of the world. The contrast between Soviet expressions of respect for human rights and the actual treatment accorded to people subject to its will was stark. It was natural for the nations of the "Atlantic Community" —the free nations of Western Europe and North America—to pick up the challenge. Despite diverse backgrounds and interests, they share a fundamental bond of common values. Twice in this century they had pooled their strength in a common effort to preserve those values from totalitarian aggression. They had fought not simply to preserve their national territory and sovereignty but, more importantly, to preserve a free and open society based upon the dignity, worth and needs of the individual.

In December 1946 Ernest Bevin, then Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom, in a private talk with Secretary of State George Marshall, made an extraordinarily prescient statement, which he substantially repeated later in the House of Commons:[5]

"I am convinced that the salvation of the West depends upon the formation of some form of union, formal or informal in character, in Western Europe, backed by the United States and the Dominions, such a mobilization of *moral and material strength as will inspire confidence and energy within and respect elsewhere.*" (Emphasis added.)

"Material strength," particularly military strength, is controversial and newsworthy. It makes daily headlines. "Moral strength" is anything but newsworthy, and the efforts by the governments and peoples of the Atlantic nations to develop it have received minimal attention. Yet ultimately a military alliance cannot endure and be effective unless it is based upon common moral values from which their civic values derive. There must also be wide public understanding that *the purpose of the alliance is to preserve shared values.*

The Preamble of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 states the determination of the Parties:[6]

> "To safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

Article 2 of the Treaty states that:

> "The Parties will contribute toward the future development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which those institutions are founded."

During the 1950s two conferences of European and North American leaders undertook to codify the common basic values of the West. The first was the Conference on the Atlantic Community, held at Bruges, Belgium in September 1957, sponsored by the College of Europe and the University of Pennsylvania. Its final report outlined a common conceptual framework based on six points:[7]

1) Respect for the intrinsic values of the human person;
2) Inseparability of freedom from moral responsibility;
3) Inseparability of freedom from human solidarity;
4) Tolerance;
5) Recognition that these principles are global; and
6) The need for continual self-examination, demonstration and incorporation of these principles in institutions.

A much more comprehensive statement on "The Moral and Spiritual Values of the Atlantic Community" was adopted by the Atlantic Congress in London in June 1959.[8] It endorsed the fundamental rights recognized in the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration. It also declared that the member countries of the Atlantic Community, despite differences in their cultural, political and spiritual outlooks, formed "a moral unity which expresses itself through common principles." It continued:

> "Respect for human dignity is the inalienable basis of civilization. The purpose of political and economic society is to create conditions enabling every human being freely to fulfill his destiny. . . . The guarantee of this dignity is, first, the recognition of objective spiritual values which cannot be altered by any human agency but are the expression of a natural or transcendent law governing communities and individuals alike."*

These documents and statements celebrate a mixture of several kinds of values—personal, spiritual, religious, moral and civic. In our pluralistic democratic societies we no longer expect universal agreement on all kinds of values. Indeed, tolerance for divergencies in values, and value criticism, are themselves central in a free society. We do believe however that there is virtually universal agreement on certain fundamental ones.

If we are to speak, then, of teaching and transmitting values, we must choose those which we are most likely to hold in common, the values which guarantee the continuance of respect for human dignity and freedom. These values leave room for considerable differences in social, cultural and spiritual values among, and within, the nations of the Atlantic Community. They still bind them together as societies dedicated to a shared belief about what constitutes a good and agreeable social order.

Integrity and honesty, for example, are basic to the governance of any civilized society. So are tolerance, objectivity, compassion, and respect for the rights of others. Included as well are civility, humility, sympathy, benevolence, open-mindedness, self-control, reasoned discourse, independent thought, the sense of individual responsibility, participation in the democratic process and devotion to the common good.

These values are essential to a society in which the rule of law assures the protection of the human rights to freedom of religious belief, of assembly, of inquiry, of expression. To the extent they are lived up to, such a society assures integrity, justice and equality of opportunity, civic liberties, accountability of those who govern, respect for all persons, their property and their values. Such a society guarantees the right to examine and criticize institutions from school to state and to assess whether their proclaimed values are authentically applied to their practices. With the right to criticize comes the duty to do so with intelligence and on the basis of reason rather than emotion. The quality of a society is determined by the extent to which these values are authentically practiced.

**Because they are so little known in contrast to the U.N. documents, extracts from both the Bruges and the London Statements are given in the Appendix.*

The preservation, refinement and extension of these civic values is requisite for all the nations of the Atlantic Community within their own borders. But, today, in a world of inescapable interdependence the responsibility must extend beyond national boundaries to the development of the same values transnationally. Only on such a basis of shared civic values can a viable system of international relationships and peace be firmly grounded.

Governments, universities, churches and many other institutions are groping for solutions to some of the most complex problems humans have ever faced. In a world society not yet subject to any comprehensive rule of law the basic civic values we have enumerated are respected to varying degrees, or even disregarded, or violated, by legally sovereign states. The nations of the Atlantic Community have a special responsibility to affirm those values, to respect them scrupulously, and to promote them on the international scene. To do less is to court disunity, and the diaster of capitulation to a world order which decries human freedom and dignity.

The civic values nurtured in the history of the Western world can inspire individual and national loyalty, and a willingness to sacrifice some measure of personal and national interest. Those values are so fundamental that they must stand above immediate political issues. They are firmly rooted in deeper truths of nature and religion that give priority and order to the resolution of our more mundane human issues.

We have emphasized civic values—those intrinsic to the preservation of free and democratic societies and a civilized life. These are minimal value commitments. Each mature person will also hold spiritual, religious, social, cultural values that further enrich his or her personal life. We have focused on the fundamental civic values because these we believe are sufficiently widely accepted to form the basis for an education in values in democratic societies in which by definition we can expect a wide variety of other values to be cherished by individual citizens.

It is the transmission of these civic values to the members of the "Successor Generation" that we deem essential to the preservation of a free world and which should be a more conscious and specific responsibility of educational institutions than they are at present.

PART II

The Responsibility of Educational Institutions

The inculcation of the dominant values of a culture has always been intrinsic to the education of youth. In the earlier years these values were generally inculcated by direct indoctrination and, as the student grew older, a more critical and sophisticated examination of received values was encouraged. At all levels, however, there was assent to a set of values considered essential to the good life, to social order and a hopeful future for humankind.

In contrast, in the last half century the tendency has been to question whether school and college ought to attempt to transmit the classic values of the Western world or the principles of democracy. Some argued that any attempt to inculcate values, no matter how positive they might be, risked the worst kind of indoctrination. Others feared that educators would not be sensitive to the range of values in the community or that attempts to teach values would invade personal or family privacy. Not only was the teaching of personal and social values questioned, but in some cases this questioning extended to the civic values basic to democratic society. A kind of moral neutrality became the posture of many educators, sometimes to protect themselves from administrative or community pressures.

Similarly the concept of education as a benefit *both* for the individual and society was weakened. Emphasis shifted from the preparation of responsible citizens to the fulfillment of personal needs and material success. Religious values were necessarily excluded and this has been appropriate in public schools in a pluralistic and democratic society. Unfortunately, some of the values of the heritage of the West were excluded too, on the mistaken notion that value neutrality extended to civic as well as religious values.

More recently, the dangers of value neutrality as an end in itself are being recognized. More educators now regard the transmission of civic values as a serious responsibility at all educational levels. The Atlantic Council Working Group believes this new emphasis is of crucial importance to the future of our democratic societies. In the interests of fostering this movement our Group offers some suggestions on how education in civic values could be successfully conducted.

We should recall at the outset that all instruction, and indeed all human learning, involves a conscious or unconscious communication of

values. Curricular design, topic selection, the use of materials and their emphases—all involve value choices. Teaching from a value-neutral stance itself involves a value judgment. Educators are therefore implicitly and explicitly immersed in communicating values and it is essential that they be conscious of their choices and be critical of their reasons for making them.

The responsibility for developing an understanding of civic values pervades the whole educational process. It begins in the family, and first of all, by example. It continues through every succeeding step on the educational ladder and extends throughout the whole of a person's life. At each level there must be a consensus about the values considered essential to social order and the promise of a hopeful future for humankind.

The direct and indirect inculcation of values begins at a very early age. Family example, good or bad, and the accompanying inculcation of moral precepts, are the earliest and perhaps the most powerful influence. Peer pressures also come early. Even in the most favorable environment, they can conflict with received values. Early exposure to television dramatizes a variety of values and value conflicts and shapes the child's reactions to them, often in deleterious ways. By the time a child goes to school he or she has received a great deal of value "education." This is long before acquiring the capacity for abstract reasoning and for assimilating what is received. Only the most ardent advocate of "value-neutral" education is likely to fault a kindergarten teacher for telling a child that it is wrong to lie or steal. The majority of educators would not question the propriety of teaching that it is right to obey the law, to respect the person and property of others, and to be truthful. At an early age, in the family and in school, precepts and the refinement of values are a reality and a necessity.

As the child becomes older, parental authority and precepts are brought into confrontation with those of other families, groups and one's peers. The values of peers, the media and the "counter-culture" exert greater influences. It is also at this period that the child begins to develop the capacity for the critical thinking needed to make his or her own value choices. This is when received values must be assimilated as one's own, or rejected and replaced with other values.

As the student progresses from the secondary school to college it is essential to teach values in an increasingly sophisticated way. We must remember that the same questions—about freedom, truth, honesty, democracy—are taught from primary school to the university—at first by precept and then by critical examination. It is the degree of depth, sophistication and complexity of the instruction which distinguishes one level of education from another and marks the progression from

inculcation to thoughtful choice, evaluation and ultimate assimilation—making a set of values one's own.

Granting the importance of all the influences that enter into the formation of a person's value system, the university's prime responsibility is to provide a knowledge in depth of the major values in Western democracy and to equip the student with the intellectual tools for informed criticism of those values. If these two pedagogic obligations are fulfilled the university serves a free society by preparing citizens who will not be mere parrots of other people's opinions. They will be able to safeguard themselves against the rhetoric of political demagogues and the manipulations of the media. Important too, in a technological society, is the capacity to determine how much of an expert's testimony is hard fact and how much simply his opinion.

A responsible and educated citizen requires more than a critical intelligence, indispensable as that may be. He needs to have inculcated a clear set of values—a stance and starting point—a set of compass points and benchmarks against which to test opposing value systems. Self-appraisal, meeting the challenge of opposing values, and assimilating values as one's own are impossible without understanding one system of values well. Each of us is formed by our traditions and a first step in education is to make that tradition visible before deciding what, if anything, may be wanting in it.

At every level of education then, there is the need to study, examine and see in practice those civic values outlined in Part I of this paper—those civic values that define free and democratic societies. Early inculcation of a system of beliefs does not imply rigid close-mindedness if it is carried out with respect for the freedom of students to question and dissent.

Indeed in a mature educated person we expect to find the capacity to speak with authority but without authoritarianism, of morality without moralizing, of the spirit of law without idolizing its letter, of limits to legitimate dissent without repressing the exploration of new truths.

Inculcation of knowledge of values is not enough to assure good citizenship. Education must also develop understanding which provides the basis for sound judgement and wise choices among conflicting values and pressures. A mature democratic society requires citizens with a clear comprehension and firm commitment to the values they have chosen for themselves and their society.

With maturation in making value decisions there is a greater personal setting of goals, standards, objectives and actions. These are the marks of the sturdy and discriminating intellect that democracy and self-government require. Admittedly many influences shape this process of maturation. But formal education has at least six responsibilities to

initiate and enhance what must, of necessity, be a life-long process.

First, is to provide a clear, authentic and faithful exposition of the values of a good society, one that is free, democratic, and respectful of the dignity of each of its members. Those values must also be practiced in the process of education itself or they will carry little conviction.

Second, is to provide the student, at the appropriate point in his educational development, with the bases of different value systems, allowing for critical commentary and enhancing the student's capabilities to make his own judgments about them and the value system he has received.

Third, is to provide instruction in a sufficiently wide range of disciplines so that the evaluation of one's own and other belief systems is informed and seriously pursued.

Fourth, is to encourage the student to evolve a personal framework of values for committed living, to carry that into coherent action, and to resolve conflicts in an orderly and rational way.

Fifth, is to inculcate knowledge of the past, in terms relevant to the student's present and future. Knowledge of the past is particularly pertinent to understanding and dealing with transnational problems and potentialities.

Sixth, is for educators to reexamine the fundamental assumptions of their pedagogy. Pedagogy alone cannot guarantee a free, stable, and just international order in this nuclear age. But its role is still an important one that should be optimized.

Independent and church-related schools can fulfill these obligations over a very wide range—including their own specific moral and spiritual systems. Publicly supported institutions by their nature must avoid denominational or otherwise exclusive value systems. Yet government support should not prevent their identification, exposition and transmission of the core of shared values that undergird our democratic way of life. Indeed, public funding imposes an obligation to do so.

Educators and the general public are developing a heightened sensitivity and appreciation of the need to teach the civic values of Western democracy. There are a wide variety of courses through which this end can be achieved, provided it is consciously accepted as an end.

History has always been valuable in this respect, but insufficient attention has been given to the momentous developments of the last 35 years, the unprecedented interdependence of all the nations in our world and the new issues thus created for the future of democratic societies. History is also a record of the struggles between conflicting values systems. If we are not to be prisoners of history we must understand it, and its driving forces.

Political and social sciences, and ethics are taught widely in our

educational system. They are not always taught, however, from the point of view of a set of values held superior to others but nonetheless susceptible to sound criticism without fear. There is little danger in teaching civic values as normative as long as the text and the teachers' opinions are openly examined. The same can be said of many other social sciences—history, political geography, economics, or anthropology. The classics, philosophy, religious studies, and literature abound with issues that encourage reflection on human values.

As James Billington, a member of this Working Group has phrased it—" . . . the problem is not to impose any set of values but to work toward a pluralism of the ethically committed in place of the monism of indifference." One can scarcely speak of "higher" education if a set of values and the tools of critical thought are not learned simultaneously. Only in this way can students learn to distinguish fact from opinion, to evaluate consequences and to make prudent judgements.

We hold, in short, that every subject—excluding perhaps only the most technical—can be taught with its value desiderata in view and can be the vehicle for teaching civic values. This orientation does not militate against serious study of fact and method but enhances their value by making those "connections" with life that the Commission on the Humanities has so recently called for.[9]

This Working Group has not intended to elaborate a detailed curriculum. Indeed, we hold that many curricula could achieve the aims we have outlined. What every successful curriculum must achieve is that judicious intermingling of value inculcation and criticism appropriate to each level of education. We can think of inculcation and criticism as two wedges sliding over each other. Thus in the home values are taught largely by inculcation, indoctrination and example. In primary school, inculcation is dominant still but awareness of other systems is gradually introduced. In high school, value criticism takes on a larger role as comparative and contrasting systems are examined more fully. In college, the received values—those inculcated in primary and secondary schools—are examined with greater sophistication and with the full use of the tools of critical inquiry. It is the university's special responsibility to go as deeply as possible in both teaching and research into the whole tradition of receiving values, preserving, validating, expanding, criticizing and transmitting the whole to the educated people who are to become the successor generation, and who in turn must themselves transmit the genius of Western civilization to their successors.

Not to be neglected is another crucial educational locus for value education—the professions. In a technologic society professionals and experts make decisions that are momentous for individuals and society. Physicians have access to the power of modern biology and technology;

engineers to that of physics and chemistry; psychologists to the power of the behavioral sciences. How they use that power shapes our lives and our culture and poses important moral questions. The only sure safeguard against the potential tyranny of expert opinion is the moral sensitivity and education of the professions.

It is encouraging to see that professional educators are learning to appreciate the power of professors to make value decisions that affect all of us. In medicine, for example, there is now a decade of experience in teaching ethics, human values, and the humanities *pari passu* with professional studies.[10] Research institutes like The Hastings Center, and the Kennedy Institute of Bioethics, are examining the most fundamental ethical issues in biology, medicine and public policy. Like developments are beginning to take shape in nursing, the allied health professions, law, business and engineering.

Something of what has been learned in these pioneer professional programs is translatable to other levels of education. In recent years a number of curricula and special programs aimed at teaching values have been introduced. Two of these—one at a small private liberal arts college and one at a very large state university—are examples of what is transpiring in higher education.

Alverno College considers valuing the core of the educational process. Its theory is that discussions about "What is good?" "What ought to be done?" "What is worth striving for?" are implicit in every human endeavor and its entire curriculum is designed to make those decisions explicit.

Michigan State University, in a program of "Reverse Technical Assistance" which includes non-Western as well as Western scholars, has four principal objectives:

1. Identifying value issues that require special consideration by academic humanities programs, particularly those issues with wide social implications;

2. Heightening the awareness of all individuals engaged in the humanistic educational effort to the potential of the humanities for resolving such issues;

3. Expanding the content and perspective of the humanistic disciplines and courses to more universal dimensions; and

4. Developing pedagogic techniques in humanistic education that more effectively shape values and develop more global perspectives.

Further information may be obtained from each of these institutions. The Association of American Colleges' "Forum" issue of January/February 1982 describes the Alverno and several other experiments.

Democratic Values in the Future

Today's youth have been born, and will live, in an era of unprecedented technological advance and global interdependence. It is an age also over which loom the prospects of nuclear power and armaments. The resultant complexity and gravity of today's problems pose special challenges and add whole dimensions to the teaching of values. An appreciation of the momentous events of recent history is, therefore, a contextual necessity for tomorrow's leaders. They need to understand fully why the free nations found it necessary to fight World War II as well as their reluctance then to fight unless attacked. Could that war have been averted? How? How is the catastrophe of another world war to be avoided?

They must understand the need, uses and limitations of technological knowledge and the challenges to traditional values technology can pose. How can they use technology for humane purposes and not be overshadowed by it?

They must understand that civic values now have an international dimension, and must be shared across national boundaries. No nation-state is able now by itself to provide the basic freedoms on which free societies depend. What are the implications of this interdependence and how can we cope with them?

Greater human fulfillment lies not in hermit national enclaves but in the interaction of societies in a world community. It requires a unity of purpose and effort among like-minded nations of a degree yet to be achieved. It raises new problems of value commitment and choice and a mutual adjustment among nations that will require the full energy, attention and good will of the successor generations of all the nations of the free world. Can we find that "equal justice," which Reinhold Niebuhr calls "the most rational ultimate objective of society," more important even than peace?[11]

The questions already lie exposed before us. What sacrifices must individuals and industries, their owners and workers, make when the economy and the public as a whole benefit from competitive imports? What sacrifices will the well-fed nations make to alleviate hunger in distant lands? What sacrifices and what means are demanded or justified by free nations to defend their way of life? Most challenging of all questions—how do we resolve the moral dilemma of profound horror at the possibility of nuclear war on the one hand, and the obligation on the other to maintain and transmit to the future the heritage of freedom?

The need for sound discrimination among competing and contrasting value systems has accelerated with our transition into the age of technological prowess, global interdependence, nuclear power and space travel. Never in the history of humankind have Alfred North Whitehead's words been more pertinent: "The future is big with every possibility of achievement and tragedy."[12]

Whether it is achievement or tragedy the successor generation will experience depends very much on what values they choose to work, suffer, live, pay and die for. The free world must commit itself again to those values that enhance freedom and dignity; it must live those values genuinely; and through the sincerity of its commitment call forth the same aspirations that lie repressed in those who now must live in the shadow of governments that deny those values.

We have said much about the obligations of educators because we believe in a real sense with Whitehead that "The task of the university is to create the future so far as rational thought and civilized modes of appreciation can affect the issue."[13]

In the long run, the free and democratic way of life will survive only if those who espouse it can comprehend it, value it enough to sacrifice for it, and live it genuinely. This is the hope our Working Group nourishes for the "successor generation"—that they will preserve, refine and enrich their heritage and through their witness transmit it to all the peoples of the world.

Additional Comments

By Judith Torney-Purta, Carole L. Hahn, and James Becker

Although we are in agreement with the basic concerns expressed in the paper, we wish to emphasize two points only briefly noted there. First, the decline in education's contribution to transmitting basic civic values is not the result of casual decisions by individual teachers to stop teaching these values. Local school boards in the United States attempt to insure that schools transmit community values. These boards also influence the hiring and firing of teachers. In response to feared and often real complaints from the community, many teachers have become cautious about making value statements in class. No publication of the Atlantic Council by itself can change this pressure on teachers. Such a publication can encourage the discussion of this problem by groups such as professional organizations of educators, school boards and parents.

Our second concern is that we believe more attention should be paid to the importance of discussing controversial issues in the classroom in the age period starting at about eleven. Research in the United States and other nations documents that students benefit enormously in the acquisition of democratic values from such discussion. Inculcation of civic values is appropriate in the early grades but must be balanced by critical issue discussion beginning at about grade six. Those who wish to effectively promote democracy should encourage administrators to implement programs concerned with civic values and support teachers who bring the discussion of controversial issues into their classrooms.

FOOTNOTES

1. Richard Morrill, Conference Report on the Bellagio Conference, July 1-6, 1980 on "The Role of the University in the Search for International Value Consensus." Rockefeller Foundation, New York, January 1982, pp. 6 and 46.

2. Teilhard de Chardin, *The Phenomenon of Man*, Harper and Row, p. 212.

3. Charter of the United Nations, signed in San Francisco June 26, 1945. Department of State publication 2353, conference series 74.

4. U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly December 10, 1948 (48 votes to none with abstentions by the communist member states, South Africa and Saudi Arabia).

5. Parliamentary Debates, House of Commons 1947-48, Fifth Series, Vol. 446, Columns 383 ff.

6. North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington April 4, 1949. Preamble and Article 2.

7. Final report of the Commission on Religious and Spiritual Values of the Conference on Atlantic Community (Bruges 1957). Ernst Bieri, *et al. Basic Values of the Atlantic Community*, London, Pall Mall Press Ltd., 1962, pp. 129-130.

8. The Moral and Spiritual Values of the Atlantic Community, statement adopted by the Atlantic Congress in London, June 1959. Gerhard Mally, *The European Community in Perspective*, Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Co., Lexington, Mass. 1973, pp. 332-3.

9. *The Humanities in American Life*, Report of the Commission on the Humanities, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1980, 192 pp.

10. E. D. Pellegrino and Thomas K. McElhinney, *Teaching Ethics, The Humanities and Human Values in Medical Schools: A Ten-Year Overview*, Institute on Human Values in Medicine, Society for Health and Human Values, Washington, D.C. 1982.

11. Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society*, Scribners, pp. 284-5.

12. Alfred North Whitehead, *Modes of Thought*, Capricorn, N.Y., 1958, p. 233.

13. Alfred North Whitehead, *ibid*.

APPENDIX

Statement on common basic values of the West, adopted by the conference on the Atlantic Community, Bruges, Belgium, September 1957.

(1) Firstly, respect for the intrinsic value of the human person as such, a value transcending all idolatrous and absolute conceptions of the State.

(2) Secondly, the inseparability of freedom from the moral responsibility of the individual, which presupposes reference to a higher law, however the latter may be designated.

(3) Thirdly, the inseparability of freedom from human solidarity and the duty to promote progressively the material and spiritual welfare of all mankind.

(4) Fourthly, the Atlantic Community is a "civilization of dialogue"; this implies toleration and free discussion of opinions, but a toleration kept within bounds ensuring the maintenance of the institutions which make such free discussion possible.

(5) Fifthly, it is essential that the members of the Atlantic Community realize that these principles are not their exclusive property but are shared by other civilizations.

(6) Finally, the Atlantic Community is aware of the need to reexamine itself continually, and aware also of the internal and external dangers jeopardizing the survival of these principles. It therefore stresses the continual and urgent need to demonstrate these principles to successive generations and to incorporate them in its institutions.*

Statement on "The Moral and Spiritual Values of the Atlantic Community," adopted by the Atlantic Congress, London, June 1959.

1. The Atlantic Congress states that, in spite of differences in their cultural, political and spiritual outlook, the member countries of the Community must realize that they form a moral unity which expresses itself through common principles.
2. Respect for human dignity is the inalienable basis of civilization. The purpose of political and economic society is to create conditions enabling every human being freely to fulfill his destiny.
3. The guarantee of this dignity is, first, the recognition of objective

*Ernest Bieri, *et al. Basic Values of the Atlantic Community.* London, Pall Mall Press, Ltd. 1962.

spiritual values which cannot be altered by any human agency but are the expression of a natural or transcendent law governing communities and individuals alike.

4. Among the fundamental rights which every authority must recognize and guarantee and which are recognized in the UN Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the following should be specifically mentioned:
   a. The right to life; the worth of human being—in short, respect for the sanctity of human life.
   b. The right to an inviolate personal life.
   c. Freedom of speech, conscience, opinion, belief, religion and association.
   d. The right of every man to work and receive his just reward.
   e. The right of the family to stability and the right of parents over their children and their education.
5. The Atlantic Community recognizes that political and economic society is based indissolubly on the dual principle of individual liberty and the common good. It deplores selfish individualism as much as any form of totalitarianism. It is, moreover, open to all political and economic regimes which respect its basic principles.
6. The safeguards of both rights and duties of individuals and peoples must be constitutionally expressed. The Law is the essential instrument through which the principles of civilization are put into practice.
7. Respect due to every human being implies the duty to bring material and spiritual well-being progressively within the reach of all at both national and international levels.
8. Peace and unity among all men with justice and freedom are the highest expression of the application of those principles which the Community seeks to promote.
9. Civilization is the common product of all peoples. In particular, Africa, Asia and Oceania have a part to play side by side with the Western peoples. It is important to realize that the common values of civilization are differently expressed by different peoples according to their various traditions.
10. At a time when the future of the world is at stake, when the enslaved peoples are looking for hope, when the peoples of Africa, Asia and Oceania have a decisive choice before them, the Atlantic Community must put forward a constructive concept of civilization of the future, which is capable of winning everyone's support, and must demonstrate by its actions that it is determined to promote that idea.*

---

*Cited in Gerhard Mally *The European Community in Perspective*, Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Co., Lexington, Mass. 1973.

Application

The Honorable Kenneth Rush
Chairman
The Atlantic Council of the United States
1616 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Ambassador Rush:

I want to help with the important work of the Atlantic Council. Please accept my application as a contributing Sponsor for the next year. I enclose my tax-deductible contribution:

☐	$5,000—	*Patron*
☐	$500-$1,000	*Friend of the Council*
☐	$100-$500	*As a Special Contribution*
☐	$35-$50	*To cover cost of Council publications*

I understand that $15 of my contribution covers a subscription to the *Atlantic Community Quarterly.* In addition to the Quarterly, contributors receive the monthly *Atlantic Community News,* the *NATO Review,* and current issues of policy papers.

Please print:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Occupation: _____

How did you learn about the Council? _____

_____

Please make checks payable to The Atlantic Council. Your check is your receipt.

Friends of the Atlantic Council may wish to provide for its continuing work by bequest. The Council's legal title is "The Atlantic Council of the United States, Incorporated, an education corporation having its principal office at 1616 H Street, Northwest, Washington, District of Columbia". Memorial opportunities may be determined by prior consultation with the Council's officers.

The Atlantic Council
of the United States
Policy Papers

The following publications are available, prepaid, from the Atlantic Council:

Toward A Consensus on Military Service, Andrew J. Goodpaster and Lloyd H. Elliott, Co-Chairmen, Joseph W. Harned, Project Director. 70 pp. $6.00. June 1982.

US Policy Towards Canada: The Neighbor We Cannot Take for Granted, Willis C. Armstrong, Chairman and Rapporteur, Louise S. Armstrong, Co-Rapporteur, Francis O. Wilcox, Project Director. 33 pp. $4.00. July 1981.

US Energy Policy and US Foreign Policy in the 1980s, John E. Gray, Chairman and Co-Rapporteur, Henry H. Fowler, Co-Chairman, Joseph W. Harned, Co-Rapporteur and Project Director. 68 pp. $6.00. June 1981.

US-Japan Energy Relationships in the 1980s, John E. Gray, Chairman of the Energy Policy Committee, and Yoshizane Iwasa, Chairman of the Japan-US Energy Relationships Committee. 46 pp. $6.00. June 1981.

The Credibility of the NATO Deterrent: Bringing the NATO Deterrent up to date, Kenneth Rush and Brent Scowcroft, Co-Chairmen, Joseph J. Wolf, Rapporteur. 54 pp. $4.00. May 1981.

The Successor Generation, Its Challenges and Responsibilities, Edmund D. Pellegrino, Chairman, and Robert E. Osgood, Rapporteur. 45 pp. $4.00. January 1981.

The Common Security Interests of Japan, the United States and NATO, U. Alexis Johnson, Chairman, and George R. Packard, Rapporteur. 40 pp. $6.00. December 1980.

The International Monetary System in Transition, William McChesney Martin, Co-Chairman, and Frank A. Southard, Jr., Co-Chairman and Rapporteur. 45 pp. $5.00. May 1980.

Summit Meetings and Collective Leadership in the 1980s, William C. Turner and Charles Robinson, Co-Chairmen, and Harald B. Malmgren, Rapporteur. 69 pp. $5.00. April 1980.

After Afghanistan—The Long Haul, Harlan Cleveland and Andrew J. Goodpaster, Co-Chairmen, and Joseph J. Wolf, Rapporteur, 71 pp. $6.00. March 1980.

Getting the West Out of the Oil Dilemma: An Energy Family Approach, Herschel Specter. 40 pp. $6.00. September 1979.

Oil and Turmoil: Western Choices in the Middle East, Andrew J. Goodpaster and Brent Scowcroft, Co-Chairmen, and John C. Campbell, Rapporteur. 40 pp. $6.00. September 1979.

The Soviet Merchant Marine: Economic and Strategic Challenge to the West, Robert Ellsworth and Leonard Sullivan, Jr., Co-Chairmen, and David W. Lee, Rapporteur. 38 pp. $6.00. September 1979.

Securing The Seas: Soviet Naval Challenge and Western Alliance Options, Paul H. Nitze, Chairman, and Leonard Sullivan, Jr., Rapporteur. 64 pp. $6.00. November 1978.

The Floating Rate System: The Search for Balance and Stability, William McChesney Martin, Co-Chairman, and Frank A. Southard, Jr., Co-Chairman and Rapporteur. 30 pp. $2.00. September 1978.

Nuclear Power and Nuclear Weapons Proliferation, John E. Gray, Chairman, and Joseph W. Harned, Project Director. Vol. 1, 164 pp., Policy Paper with executive summary. $6.00. Vol. 2, 140 pp., appendices, tables and figures. $6.00. June 1978.

Security in the Eastern Mediterranean: Re-Thinking American Policy, Harlan Cleveland, Chairman, and Joseph J. Wolf, Rapporteur. 19 pp. $1.00. April 1978.

The Growing Dimensions of Security, Harlan Cleveland and Andrew J. Goodpaster, Co-Chairmen, and Joseph J. Wolf, Rapporteur. 86 pp. $5.00. November 1977.

What Future for the UN? An Atlantic Dialogue, Charles W. Yost, Chairman, and Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Rapporteur. 40 pp. $2.00. October 1977.

Improving NATO Force Capabilities, John W. Vogt. 12 pp. $1.00. June 1977.

Other publications available:

Atlantic Community Quarterly ($15.00/year individual; $18.00/year institutional). Includes subscription to the monthly *Atlantic Community News*.

Issues and Options, a report of the work program of the Atlantic Council. (Free of charge).

Atlantic Council Books are distributed by trade publishers directly and through quality bookstores. A complete list of available titles will be mailed upon request.

Atlantic Council of the United States, 1616 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20006

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Atlantic Council of the United States

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chairman
Kenneth Rush

Vice Chairmen
David Acheson
Theodore C. Achilles
Harlan Cleveland
Henry H. Fowler
Andrew J. Goodpaster
Carol Laise
Wm. McCh. Martin
David Packard
Eugene V. Rostow

Treasurer
William H. G. FitzGerald

Secretary
George M. Seignious II

Director General
Francis O. Wilcox

Deputy Director General
Joseph W. Harned

Assistant Director General
Martha C. Finley

Directors

David M. Abshire
Donald G. Agger
Willis C. Armstrong
Edward W. Barrett
Andrew H. Berding
C. Fred Bergsten
Justin Blackwelder
George S. Blanchard
Gene E. Bradley
L. Dean Brown
Zbigniew Brzezinski
Daniel J. Callahan, III
Hodding Carter III
Sol C. Chaikin
Emilio G. Collado
W. Donham Crawford
Frederick L. Deming
Russell E. Dougherty
William D. Eberle
Robert F. Ellsworth
Sherwood L. Fawcett
Gerald R. Ford
George S. Franklin, Jr.
Richard N. Gardner
Lincoln Gordon
John E. Gray
Alexander M. Haig, Jr.
Christian A. Herter, Jr.
John D. Hickerson
Martin J. Hillenbrand
Claire Giannini Hoffman
Robert D. Hormats
J. Allan Hovey, Jr.
John N. Irwin II
U. Alexis Johnson
Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.
Tom Killefer
Lane Kirkland
Henry A. Kissinger
Peter F. Krogh
John M. Leddy
Lyman L. Lemnitzer
Sol M. Linowitz
Winston Lord
Jay Lovestone
Sanford N. McDonnell
George C. McGhee
Donald F. McHenry
Robert M. McKinney
Robert S. McNamara
Lawrence C. McQuade
Harald B. Malmgren
Leonard H. Marks
Edwin M. Martin
Edmund S. Muskie
Robert E. Osgood
George R. Packard
Edmund D. Pellegrino
Henry H. Porter
Jacques J. Reinstein
Stanley R. Resor
Emmett J. Rice
Elliot L. Richardson
John Richardson, Jr.
Olin C. Robison
Robert V. Roosa
H. Chapman Rose
Nathaniel Samuels
J. Robert Schaetzel
Brent Scowcroft
Raymond Philip Shafer
William E. Simon
Joseph J. Sisco
Helmut Sonnenfeldt
Frank A. Southard, Jr.
Stephen Stamas
Timothy W. Stanley
Walter J. Stoessel, Jr.
Ralph I. Straus
Robert S. Strauss
George A. Strichman
Leonard Sullivan, Jr.
Philip H. Trezise
Cyrus R. Vance
Richard D. Vine
Thomas J. Watson
Marina v.N. Whitman
Watson Wise
Joseph J. Wolf

Honorary Directors

George W. Ball
Eugene R. Black
William A. M. Burden
C. Douglas Dillon
John Ferguson III
Ralph C. M. Flynt
William C. Foster
Alfred M. Gruenther
Andrew Heiskell
Henry M. Jackson
Jacob K. Javits
Ruth C. Lawson
Henry Cabot Lodge
Oswald B. Lord
John J. McCloy
Lauris Norstad
Edmund Orgill
Herman Phleger
William P. Rogers
Dean Rusk
Adolph W. Schmidt
Cortlandt v.R. Schuyler
Charles M. Spofford

BEST COPY AVAILABLE